



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,275	07/14/2003	L. Lloyd Williams	SWA01 P-106	6325
28101	7590	03/29/2005	EXAMINER	
VAN DYKE, GARDNER, LINN AND BURKHART, LLP			ANWAH, OLISA	
2851 CHARLEVOIX DRIVE, S.E.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 888695			2645	
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49588-8695				

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/619,275 Examiner Olisa Anwah	Applicant(s) WILLIAMS, L. LLOYD
	Art Unit 2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 28 recites the limitation "proxy server" in line 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in-
 - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
 - (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 16, 17, 30, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Petrunka et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,369 (hereinafter Petrunka).

Regarding claim 16, Petrunka discloses a system for enabling a requesting party to initiate a telephone call

Art Unit: 2645

directly to a voice mail box associated with a service subscriber to a voice mail system (VMS), comprising:

a call control node configured as a virtual service switching point in a switched telephone network, the call control node being adapted to receive a connection request message sent in response to a request to access the voice mail box by a calling party, the connection request message requesting setup of a direct call to a voice mail box, and to respond to the connection request message by formulating a call set-up message to initiate establishment of a call connection to the VMS, the call set-up message having a format reserved for redirected call set-up messages used by switching points to redirect uncompleted calls to the service subscriber, so that the VMS provides access to the voice mail box (see Figure 4).

Regarding claim 17, see column 4 of Petrunka.

Claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 16.

Regarding claim 31, see Figure 3.

Regarding claim 33, see Figure 3.

Art Unit: 2645

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka in view of Holt, U.S. Patent No. 6,711,243 (hereinafter Holt).

Regarding claim 18, because Petrunka teaches the network is an AIN network (column 4), Petrunka inherently teaches the claimed CCS network, SS7 protocol, ISUP and IAM limitations. However, Petrunka fails to disclose the claimed inserting limitations. Nonetheless Holt discloses these limitations (see column 5). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Petrunka with the inserting limitations taught by Holt. This modification would have modernized Petrunka by obviating the necessity of maintaining subscriber information on the service nodes as suggested by Holt.

Art Unit: 2645

6. Claims 19-24, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Holt in further view of Russell, Travis. *Signaling System #7* New York: McGraw Hill, 2000 (hereinafter Russell).

With respect to claim 19, the combination of Petrunka and Holt fails to teach inserting a redirecting reason code into a redirection information parameter, the reason code being a default value indicating that the reasons for redirection is unknown or not available. However Russell discloses this limitation (see page 461). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka and Holt with the reason code taught by Russell. This modification allows for a parameter that provides information as to why the call was diverted and the nature of the call as suggested by Russell (page 496).

Regarding claim 20, see Figures 3 and 5 from Holt and Figure 4 from Petrunka.

Regarding claim 21, see Figures 3 and 5 from Holt and Figure 4 from Petrunka.

Regarding claim 22, see Figures 3 and 5 from Holt and Figure 4 from Petrunka.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 24, see Figures 3 and 5 from Holt and Figure 4 from Petrunka.

Regarding claim 28, see Figures 3 and 5 from Holt and Figure 4 from Petrunka.

Regarding claim 29, see page 461 of Russell.

7. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Holt and Russell in further view of Tov et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0152402 (hereinafter Tov).

With respect to claim 25, the combination of Petrunka, Holt and Russell does not disclose the claimed server. Nonetheless Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka, Holt and Russell with the web page taught by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

Regarding claim 26, see paragraph 0041 of Tov, Figure 3-5 of Holt and Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Regarding claim 27, see paragraph 0041 of Tov, Figure 3-5 of Holt and Figure 4 of Petrunka.

8. Claims 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka in view of Tov.

With respect to claim 32, Petrunka does not disclose the claimed server. Nonetheless Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Petrunka with the web page taught by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

With respect to claim 34, Petrunka does not disclose the claimed IP network. Nonetheless Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Petrunka with the IP network taught by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

Art Unit: 2645

9. Claims 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrunka combined with Holt in further view of Tov.

Regarding claim 35, the combination of Petrunka and Holt discloses the claimed forwarding and receiving means as explained in the rejection of claim 18. Nonetheless the combination of Petrunka and Holt does not disclose the claimed user interface. All the same, Tov discloses this limitation (see paragraph 0041). Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Petrunka and Holt with the user interface disclosed by Tov. This modification would have improved user convenience by allowing the voice mailbox to be accessed graphically as suggested by Tov (see Figure 5).

Regarding claim 36, see paragraph 0041 of Tov, Figures 3-5 of Holt and Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Regarding claim 37, see paragraph 0041 of Tov, Figures 3-5 of Holt and Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Regarding claim 38 see Figure 5 of Tov.

Regarding claim 39 see paragraph 0041 of Tov.

Regarding claim 40, see paragraph 0041 of Tov, Figures 3-5 of Holt and Figure 4 of Petrunka.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 703-305-4814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 703-305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

O.A.
Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
January 19, 2005


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600